DAVID B. FITZPATRICK, B.SC., F.I.P.A.A.
PETER N. NICHOLLS, B.A., B.SC., F.I.P.A.A.
TERRENCE J. COLLINS, DIP.MECH.E., F.I.P.A.A.
JOHN A. WATERS, A.R.M.I.T., F.I.P.A.A.
MALCOLM J. ROYAL DIP.APP.CHEM., F.I.P.A.A.
CONSULTANT:
BERTRAM C. FITZPATRICK, F.I.P.A.A., M.C.I.P.A.

IN REPLY PLEASE QUOTE OUR REFERENCE
CABLES: MANAGEABLE MELBOURNE
TELEPHONE: (03) 62 5011

AIRMAIL

Messrs. Watson, Leavenworth, Kelton   14th December, 1973
         & Taggart,
100 Park Avenue,
New York, N.Y. 10017,
U.S.A.

RECEIVED
WLK&T
DEC 26 1973

Dear Sirs,

re: (MJR:JW) PHILIP MORRIS INCORPORATED
    Australian Patent Appln. No. 32548/71
    Filed 19th August, 1971
    Your Ref: 582-736 Foreign

FILE 582-736 Australia

The above application has been examined and a copy of the report is attached for your consideration and comprehensive instructions. To minimize complications and expense we recommend you aim for allowance inside the twelve month acceptance period which expires on:

13th November, 1974

It is pleasing to note that the Examiner has not referred to prior art located in his search. We believe that the second objection can be attended to by making a clear statement in the description that the invention includes as an embodiment the matter claimed in claim 17. Similarly on a theoretical basis at least the ground of objection No. 3 can be removed by inserting an appropriate statement in the description. But we believe that if we do this the Examiner will then object that claim 18 defines a different invention to claim 1 and will require division. If the claim is of importance then we suggest that you instruct us to proceed by appropriate amendment of the description and then divide later if the Examiner does raise the objection.

Yours faithfully,
PHILLIPS ORMONDE & FITZPATRICK

(Malcolm J. Royal)

DUE DATE 5/13/74
DOCKETED 12/26/73
BY   JW
NOTED
Enc. d/n